

### REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being fully anticipated by U.S. patent application publication no. 20030031353 (Baertsch, et al.), and rejected Claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Baertsch, et al. in view of U.S. patent application publication no. 2003014879 (Wilsher, et al.). Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite. The Examiner also objected to Claims 3-7, 10, 11 and 14-19 as being dependent from a rejected base claim, and indicated that these claims would be allowable if appropriately rewritten.

Independent Claims 1, 8 and 12 are being amended to better define the subject matters of these claims. Claims 3, 4, 5, 10, 14, 15, 16 and 19 are being rewritten in independent form, and Claim 19 is also being amended to address the rejection of the Claim under 35 U.S.C. 112. Additional changes are being made to Claims 5 and 6 to improve the form of these claims. New Claim 20, which is dependent from Claim 1, is being added to describe a preferred feature of the invention.

For the reasons discussed below, all of Claims 1-20 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The Examiner is thus respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the above-identified rejections of Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 12, 13 and 19, and the objections to Claims 3-7, 10, 11 and 14-19, and to allow Claims 1-20.

More specifically, Claims 3, 4 and 5 are each being re-written in independent form including the limitations of original Claim 1, and Claim 10 is being rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of original Claim 8. Claims 14, 15, 16

and 19 are each being rewritten in independent form including the limitations of original Claim 12.

Claim 19, as mentioned above, is also being amended to delete the material to which the Examiner objected, and in particular, to take out the parenthetical references to the first and second test patterns. With these change, Claim 19 is clear and definite and fully complies with 35 U.S.C. 112. The Examiner is, accordingly, asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 112.

In view of the above-discussed changes to Claims 3, 4, 5, 14, 15, 16 and 19, it is believed that these claims are now in condition for allowance. Claims 6 and 7 are dependent from Claim 5 and are allowable therewith; and claim 11 is dependent from, and is allowable with, Claim 10. Likewise, Claims 17 and 18 are dependent from Claim 16 and are allowable therewith. The Examiner is thus asked also to reconsider and to withdraw the objections to Claims 3-7, 10, 11 and 14-19, and to allow these claims:

With respect to Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 12 and 13, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims also patentably distinguish over the prior art because the references of record to not disclose or suggest the principal – described in independent Claims 1, 8 and 12 – of processing the received signals to distinguish between simultaneously occurring first and second series of events. In order to best appreciate this, Applicant believes it may be helpful to review this invention and the prior art.

The present invention, generally, relates to electrical devices that utilize a timing trigger to synchronize an input signal or set of signals. One important objective of the preferred embodiment of the invention is to capture simultaneously timing information

from an electrical device with respect to two or more timing signals. This embodiment of the invention is particularly well suited for use with multisynchronous PICA systems.

In accordance with the preferred embodiment of the invention, first and second sets of responses are generated from an electronic device in response to first and second stimuli, respectively. Each of the first set of responses represents a series of first events, and each of the second set of responses represents a series of second events. These second events occur simultaneously with the first events. These first and second sets of responses are processed to identify to distinguish the first events from the second events, and to identify responses that are in synchronization with the first stimulus and to identify responses that are in synchronization with the second stimulus.

Baertsch, et al, the primary reference relied on by the Examiner to reject Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 12 and 13, discloses a radioscopic imaging system.

Wilsher describes a PICA system having timing measurements and calibration procedures. However, Wilsher also fails to disclose or suggest utilizing a timing synchronization for the purpose of averaging many measurements over a period of time as a means of distinguishing two or more series of events that are occurring simultaneously.

Each of independent Claims 1, 8 and 12 describe important features not disclosed either in Baertsch, et al. or in Wilsher. Specifically, Claims 1 and 8, which are directed to methods of processing timing information from an electronic device, sets forth the step of processing the received first and second sets of responses – which represent series of first and second events respectively - to distinguish those first events from those second events. Claim 12, which defines a system for processing timing information from an

electronic device, describes a processor for processing the received first and second sets of responses to distinguish the first events from the second events.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and these other references, whether considered individually or in combination, also fail to teach this principal of this invention.

Because of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 8 and 12 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, these claims patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2 and 20 are dependent from Claim 1 and are allowable therewith. Also, claims 9 and 13 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claims 8 and 12 respectively. The Examiner is, hence, asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1, 2, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102 and the rejection of Claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103, and to allow Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 12, 13 and 20.

For the reasons advanced above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, and the objections to Claims 3-7, 10, 11 and 14-19. The Examiner is also asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102 and the rejection of Claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103, and to allow Claims 1-20.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's Attorneys would be advantageous to the case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully Submitted,

*John S. Sensny*  
John S. Sensny  
Registration No.: 28,757  
Attorney for Applicants

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343

JSS:jy